

SN:09/823,425

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

MPT-001

REMARKS

Claim 14 is amended to include the limitations of original Claims 14, 15 and 16. This amendment is supported by at least original Claims 14, 15, and 16.

Claims 17, 18, and 19 are amended to depend from Claim 14 rather than a cancelled claim.

No New matter is added.

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

Drawings

In the office action summary at action item 10), the Examiner did not mark whether the drawings filed on March 30, 2001 were accepted or objected to by the Examiner. Because the Examiner did not make mention of the drawings in the detailed Office Action, Applicant has assumed that the drawings filed on March 30, 2001 were accepted. However, if this assumption is inaccurate please notify the Applicant as soon as possible so that corrective measures can be taken.

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

CLAIMSClaim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-13 under "35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murray [6,392,558 B1]." With regards to Claim 1, the Examiner states that:

Murray discloses a data display system implemented by configuring generic client software (i.e.: software module), the data display system comprising:

A data display frame configured to display a current data record [Murray, the browser displays a current page, col 5 lines 52-col 6 line 6]; and

A data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record [Murray, the software module selects the corresponding marker from the list. The marker generation module inserts the marker along with coordinates indicating proper display position and other parameters into the current page, col 6 lines 48-64].

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner erred in interpreting Murray due to the unfortunate coincidence of the same words ("identifier" and "marker") being used for different objects in Murray and the present application. Claim 1 recites "a data display frame configured to display a current data record; and a data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record." (emphasis added).

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

The Examiner cites current page (245) of Murray as the "current data record" recited in Claim 1. However, Claim one specifically states that there is "a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record." However in Murray, "Transferred ("downloaded" or pre-stored) data is stored in some memory portion, for example the portion 245 marked 'current page,' under the control of the operating system and is then made available to the browser for de-coding and presentation on the display." (Murray, Col. 5, Lines 61-65). Furthermore, a "parsing and comparison module 266 ... scans or 'parses' the current page stored in the memory portion 245 and compares the scanned content with each identifier stored in memory block 260." (Murray, Col. 7, Lines 48-54). Thus, applicant respectfully submits the identifiers in Murray would not include a "current data identifier corresponding to the current data record" as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the markers taught by Murray are not equivalent to the "current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record" as recited in Claim 1. Murray teaches that "Associated with each stored identifier is also one or more markers." (Murray, Col. 6, Lines 31-32). Then, a

parsing and comparison module 266 ... scans or "parses" the current page stored in the memory portion 245 and compares the scanned content with each identifier stored in memory block 260. For each match, the module 262 then selects the corresponding marker (including any explanatory text associated with the matched identifier) from the list 262. The marker generation module 264 then inserts the marker ... into the current page memory 245. (emphasis added) (Murray, Col. 6 lines 48-60)

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that in Murray, markers are used to highlight identifiers within a "current page". However, in claim 1, "the current data identifier marker" is used "for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Murray. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-13, which are dependent upon Claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under "35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Murray [6,392,668 B1] in view of Swartz et al [Swartz 6,236,994B1]." Although Applicant does not agree with the rejection of original Claim 14, Applicant has amended Claim 14 to include the limitations of original Claims 15 and 16 to expedite issuance of this case. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 14 has been rendered moot by the amendment of Claim 14. Because Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 15 and 16, the Examiner's rejection of Claims 15 and 16 are now applicable to amended Claim 14. With respect to Claims 15 and 16, the Examiner stated that claims "[15]-25 contain the similar limitations set forth [in] apparatus claims 2-13. Therefore, claims [15]-25 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 2-13." However, as explained above with respect to Claim 1, Murray does not teach or suggest many of the limitations in Claim 1 and the similar limitations in amended Claim 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 14 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 14.
Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-25,
which depend from Claim 14, are also allowable.

SN:09/823,425

MPT-001

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 and 17-25 are pending in the present application. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If there are any questions, please telephone Edward Mao at (925) 895-3546 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Mao

Customer No.: 022888

Edward S. Mao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,713

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (37 C.F.R. 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: 10/6/2004 Signature: *Edward Mao*

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.